

SWEETGOSPELHARMONY.COM

E. C. Selwyn

THE  
EXPOSITOR

EDITED BY THE REV.

SIR W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

*EIGHTH SERIES*

Volume IX

1915

HODDER AND STOUGHTON  
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C

---

MCMXV



*THE TRIAL-NARRATIVES BASED ON THE  
ORACLES.*

THE statement of Papias that "Matthew collected the oracles in Hebrew" is famous and undisputed, but its importance has never been fully appreciated, and it has never been applied to the facts of the gospel-narrative. Lightfoot dated Papias 60-140 A.D. and the date may generally satisfy us, provided we do not insist that his literary activity was deferred till he was seventy years of age. When he says that "Matthew collected the oracles in Hebrew," it is usually agreed that he means in Aramaic.

What he meant by "the oracles" has been set forth by the present writer in *The Oracles in the New Testament* at some length, and he hopes to have shown that oracles are all those quotations of the Old Testament in the New Testament which were "precious words" because they were Messianic predictions, and bore, however remotely, on the Argument from Prophecy that Jesus was the Christ. Oracles, Logia, are precious words, and are not "Sayings of Jesus," as a class, although both Lightfoot and his antagonist in *Supernatural Religion* believed that they were. On this thesis I shall say no more at present because it demands a whole volume, except that, until it is admitted, exegesis can go no further. The most difficult and crucial passages of the New Testament cannot be understood or explained. Most of these involve the term *spirit*, and this cannot be understood until the Argument from Prophecy (Christ was to be such and such, Jesus was such and such; therefore Jesus is Christ) is seen to be the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae* in the first Christian century. But though we leave aside the meaning of *spirit* for the present, it is possible to see the part which oracles have borne in

the construction of the Trial-narratives, of which no harmony has ever yet been discovered: indeed harmony recedes farther and farther away as study increases and commentaries multiply.

St. Paul, however, whose epistles contain hardly a trace of the Trial-narratives—though they were then in course of slow construction and must have existed in some fluid, inchoate state—has given us a clue when he wrote (1 Cor. xv.) of the gospel which he preached: “I delivered . . . that which I received by tradition, how that Christ died for our sins *according to the scriptures*, and that he was buried, and that he hath been raised on the third day *according to the scriptures*.” The “scriptures” were the oracles, which were seen to be fulfilled. And out of the fulfilment the Trial-narratives were largely constructed: how largely they were built upon Jeremiah will now be shown.

The prophet Jeremiah being a type of the Lord, in his loneliness and aloofness, in his persecution, in his bearing the yoke, in his parables, it was found that his trial was fulfilled in that of the Lord. The two trials were obviously alike in three respects, the place, the judges, the verdict. To these fulfilments others were added as only less obvious. First, the place in Jerusalem was the temple. Next, the accusers resembled the false-prophets who accused Jeremiah. Thirdly, the accusations were identical, because Jesus had foretold the destruction of the temple in Jeremiah’s language. Besides these six fulfilments others were discovered by the evangelists or their sources, such as the reaction in favour of the Accused, the replies of Jesus to His judges, and other incidents into which we shall now inquire, our basis being the Greek Bible not the Hebrew (Jer. xxvi., xxvii. = xxxiv., xxxv. in LXX).

The order of events is almost precisely that of the gospels:—

- I. The accusation of having predicted the destruction.
- II. The clamour for the death of the Accused.
- III. The appeal to former preaching in public.
- IV. The innocent blood.
- V. The martyrdom for truth.
- VI. The reaction in favour of acquittal.
- VII. The despatch to the Idumæan.

Only the last two events are somewhat inverted in St. Luke's Gospel. And others, even more important, will follow after these.

(The words of Jeremiah (LXX) which are actually reproduced in the Gospels are here marked by italics.)

Jer. xxvi. 3 ff. And it came to pass when J. had ceased speaking all that the Lord commanded him to speak unto all the people,  
that *the priests and the false-prophets and all the people*

*seized him, saying,*

Thou shalt surely *die*,  
for thou hast *prophesied* in the name of the Lord,  
saying, This *house* shall be like Shiloh,  
and this city shall be *desolate* without an inhabitant.  
And *all the people* were gathered together against J. in the house of the Lord.

[(Matt.) And it came to pass when Jesus had finished all these words].

(Mark) The *chief priests and the scribes and the elders*. (Luke) The *c.p. and the captains* of the temple and the *c.* (Luke) The *presbytery of the people*, both *c.p.* and *scribes*.

(Mark, Matt.) to *seize me*. (Luke, John) *seized Jesus*.

(Mark) to put him to *death*.

(Mark) *Prophecy*.

(Mark) bare *false-witness . . .*  
I will destroy this temple.

(Luke, Matt.) Your *house* is left unto you [*desolate*].

(Matt.) Then were gathered together the *c.p.* and the *elders of the people . . .* to kill him.

[The words of Matthew xxvi. 1 conclude the fifth *pereq* or group of sayings, the four others being similarly concluded (vii. 28, xi. 1, xiii. 53, xix. 1). It is, however, probable that Matthew intended the discourses to reach their

climax in the final scenes. For he hastens to add that "there were gathered together the chief priests and the elders of the people . . . to kill him": which is nearly what Jeremiah says.]

The first point, however, of undoubted resemblance is the threefold denomination of the enemies of Jesus (Mark viii. 31, xi. 27, xiv. 43, 53, xv. 1) compared with the threefold description in Jeremiah. The phrase in Mark is first used at the first intimation of the Passion. And its meaning overlaps, for many priests were elders and many scribes were elders. The parallel phrase in Luke, though different, is also threefold, *captains of the temple* taking the place of *scribes*. But Luke (xxii. 66) has another strange threefold denomination, *there assembled the presbytery of the people*, both *chief priests* and *scribes*, and led Him away into their *council* (Sanhedrin). "The three component parts of the sanhedrin met" (Plummer) "and led Jesus away into their sanhedrin." This is almost inconceivable. Perhaps origination in Jeremiah xxvi. may explain it. Luke's *chief priests* are the *priests*, the *presbytery of the people* stands for *the people*, and the *scribes* for the *false-prophets*. The scribes were the established teachers, prophets were specially sent teachers. *He taught them with authority and not as the scribes*. In later times *false-prophet* and *false-teacher* were nearly synonymous (2 Pet. ii. 1).

The second point is *they seized* (συνέλαβον, in all four accounts) Jesus, as they seized Jeremiah.

The third point is that the captors are intent upon the death of the victim.

The fourth point is that while Jeremiah uses the composite word *false-prophet*, Mark uses a similar composite verb *to false-witness* twice, and Matthew the substantive. (These are not in LXX.)

The fifth point is that Jeremiah's prediction of the



destruction of the temple had been repeated by Jesus (Jer. xxii. 5, John ii. 19, Mark xiii. 2). In fact it is clear that the false-witnesses of Mark xiv. 58 made a true allegation as regards the words used by Jesus. On this point a good deal more might be written.

## II.

Jer. xxvi. 10. And *the princes* of Judah heard this word and came up from *the king's house* unto the house of the Lord, and sat down in the entry of the new gate of the Lord. Then spake the priests and the false prophets unto the princes and to all *the people*,

saying, *Judgment of death* for this man, for he hath prophesied against this city, *as ye have heard* with your ears.

(Luke) Pilate called together the *chief priests* and the *princes* and the *people*.

(Luke) And they led him into the high priest's *house*.

(Luke) unto *judgment of death*.  
(Mark, Matt.) He is guilty of *death*.

Behold, *ye have heard* the blasphemy.

(Luke) from his mouth.

The sixth point is that the princes of Judah, a most natural expression in Jeremiah, is repeated by Luke in an unintelligible connexion. Here is another threefold formula, but what does it mean? The chief priests were themselves the *princes* (*rulers*) of the people. There is no parallel in the whole New Testament to such an unqualified class-name as *the princes*. The qualified expressions, *their rulers*, *your rulers*, *rulers of the people* (Acts iv. 5, 8; Luke xxiv. 20) are not parallel. Josephus' rule is that *rulers* may stand for *chief priests*, but *rulers and chief priests* is an expression not to be used (Schürer, *H. J. P.* § 23, 3. E. T., p. 178). The explanation must be sought in Jeremiah xxvi., where the parts played by the several classes of men concerned are shifted within a few verses. First, the priests, the false-prophets and the people say that he

must die. Then the priests and the false-prophets say to the princes and the people that he must die. Then *the princes and the people* say that he must not die. After this some of the elders speak to all the assembly of the people, and quote the precedent of Micah, to show that he must not die. Finally he is saved by Ahikam, son of Josiah's minister, from death at the hands of the people. And perhaps the most remarkable feature of the whole story is the dissent of some of the elders (*ἄνδρες τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῆς γῆς*) from the policy of the main body. This dissent is reproduced, as we shall see, in Joseph of Arimathea (Luke). What now concerns us is that Pilate desires (in Luke, but this hardly appears in Mark) to spare the life of Jesus. Luke saw in Jeremiah xxvi. that *the princes and the people* urged that Jeremiah must not die. This suggested that these two classes were Pilate's natural allies. To them he makes Pilate resort (Luke xxiii. 13). The high priests he is obliged of course to summon: but *the princes and the people* are summoned in Luke because of the important function that they performed in Jeremiah.

The point becomes clearer if we observe the attitude of *the people* in the gospels. At first the multitude is neutral, wanting the release of some prisoner as the custom was, but the priests incited it to ask for Barabbas, and the words *rather release* seem to imply that there had been a preference for Jesus (Mark xv. 11). In Luke *the crowds* have no cry of their own, for the long and definite sentence in xxiii. 5 can only be spoken by the priests. Even if *they cried out together* (*παμπληθεὶ* xxiii. 18) seems the *vox populi*, *the multitude* (*τὸ πλῆθος* xxiii. 1) has been already used of the 71 Sanhedrists. The people is priest-ridden. Only Acts iii. 13 ff. makes the people responsible, while even there *your rulers* are mentioned. St. John, with Acts before him, follows Luke's Gospel in not defining the action of the crowd.

But he makes *the Jews* responsible, and in John xviii. 31 *the Jews* are distinctly the Sanhedrin and not the crowd. And in John xix. 6, 15 it is the high priests and the underlings who shout *Crucify*. On the whole, then, Luke and John tend to exonerate the people, and thus even more than Mark and Matthew to accord with Jeremiah xxvi.

The seventh and eighth points are particularly clear: *He is guilty of death* and *ye have heard* are given in almost the same words in Jeremiah and in Mark. In Luke *from his mouth* represents *with your ears* in Jeremiah.

### III.

In the appeal to former public preaching we have the supplementation by John only:—

Jer. xxvi. 12. Then spake J. unto the princes and to all the people, saying, The Lord sent me to prophecy against *this house* and against *this city* all the words that *ye have heard* . . . *ib. 7, in the house of the Lord.*

John xviii. 20. I have spoken openly to the world: I ever taught in synagogue *and in the temple* where all the Jews come together. . . . Ask *them that heard* what I spake unto them.

The ninth point of correspondence is plain: the previous speaking was in the temple. The tenth point is the appeal to the words that *ye have heard*.; *The world* in St. John usually means the Jewish world (Dr. Drummond, *Fourth Gospel*, 358 n.).

### IV.

The eleventh and twelfth points of correspondence are found in the supplementation of Matthew:—

Jer. xxvi. 15. But know ye for certain that if ye put me to death, ye bring *innocent blood* upon yourselves and upon this city and the inhabitants thereof.

Matt. xxvii. 3. I betrayed *innocent blood*. *Ib. 24 f.* I am innocent of this blood . . . His blood be on us and on our children.

Here we have no words put into our Lord's mouth. Although *innocent blood* occurs often in the Old Testament,



probably Matthew had Jeremiah xxvi. in view in describing the end of Judas. Certainly Matt. xxvii. 3 and 24 find a connecting link in Jer. xxvi. 15,

V.

The thirteenth point is more than possible, concerning the martyrdom for truth.

Jer. xxxi. 15. For *in truth* hath the Lord *sent me* to speak unto you in your ears all these words. John xviii. 37. I have come into the world that I may bear witness unto the *truth*.

Much depends upon the emphasis thrown upon *in truth* (*ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*). The words might express nothing more than asseveration, but they may on the other hand be construed with *to speak unto you*, and there is no doubt which of the two constructions would be preferred by St. John, who mentions *the truth* twenty-four times, and would seize upon his favourite words *sent me* of the mission of the Son (seventeen times).

VI.

Jer. xxvi. 6. Then said the princes and all the people unto the priests and the false-prophets, *This man is not worthy of death*. . . .

Then rose up certain men of the *elders of the land* and spake to all the *synagogue of the people*.

(Luke) Pilate said unto the chief priests and the crowds, I find no fault in *this man* . . . and behold nothing worthy of *death* hath been done by him. (John) I find no crime in him.

(Matt.) *elders of the people*. (Luke) a councillor who had not consented . . .

John xviii. 20 in *synagogue*.

The reaction in Jeremiah is headed by the *princes (rulers)* and the people, in Mark by Pilate whom Roman readers of Mark understood to be the *ruler*. Still it must be admitted that in Mark the point of this reaction is blunt, and is first sharpened in Luke, and then in John, where Pilate's vacillation is most marked.

The fourteenth point is that the declaration is made in

almost identical words in Jeremiah and in Luke, *This man is not worthy of death*. And here we note that Luke, as if to justify the plural, has introduced another *prince*, representing the power of Assyria,<sup>1</sup> Herod Antipas, as agreeing with Pilate, the power of Babylon, upon the innocence of the Accused. The other evangelists know nothing of this astounding occurrence.

The fifteenth point is that the real and genuine reaction, though ineffective, is led by *certain of the elders*. Luke is the first evangelist who definitely and clearly makes Joseph to be one. John adds Nicodemus to him in his previous dissent from the Pharisees among whom he was a *prince of the Jews* (vii. 50, iii. 1).

The sixteenth point is the use of *synagogue* to mean a public gathering. Since in John vi. 59, the only other use in John, *synagogue* has again no article, probably we ought to render, there as here, *in public as he taught in Capernaum*.

## VII.

<p>Jer. xxvii. 1. Make thee bonds (δεσμοίς) and yokes (κλοιούς) and put them upon thy neck, and thou shalt <i>despatch</i> them unto him who is king of Idumea and king of Moab and king of the sons of Ammon and king of Tyre and king of Sidon by the hands of their (this, v. l.) messengers that come to meet them (I him, v. l.) at Jerusalem to Zedekiah king of Judah.</p>	<p>(John) Annas <i>despatched</i> him bound (ἀπέστειλεν . . . δεδεμένον) unto Caiaphas. (Mark) They <i>bound</i> him and delivered him to Pilate. (Luke) Pilate sent him unto Herod.</p>
---	--

This seventeenth parallel will doubtless appear at first to be so extremely forced as to be worthless. It is not placed here without some misgiving that the robust common sense of the modern reader may find it the limit of his toleration. Nevertheless a choice has to be made whether

<sup>1</sup> See Selwyn, *The Oracles in the New Testament*, chap. ii.



the despatch to Herod is historical or not. Is it one of those events which Luke says in his preface that he had followed up in their prophetic parallels accurately?<sup>1</sup> As he alone narrates it, our duty is to ascertain whether it has precisely this prophetic support. The opinion that it is a legendary accretion has recently been challenged in one of Mr. Streeter's able contributions to the *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, on two grounds, (1) "because we can detect no apologetic motive for its growth; (2) because the statement (Luke xxiii. 12) so completely illuminates and is illuminated by certain facts elsewhere recorded." The second of these<sup>2</sup> can very well be true and yet, as to the first, it is possible to detect an apologetic motive if there is a fulfilment of prophecy: for it was just in the region of fulfilment that the *apologia* of the Christian faith in the first century stood or fell. The evangelist saw the fulfilment himself and hoped that his reader, his Theophilus, would come to see it. In this light it is no more far-fetched and fantastical than many other passages. For instance, to construe *the sure mercies of David* (Isa. lv. 3; Acts xiii. 34) into a prediction of the Resurrection of Christ is to the modern mind rather strange, and yet we know that the Apostles did so. Let us therefore bear in mind the possibly prophetic character of the Herodian incident.<sup>3</sup>

The prophet Jeremiah being ordered to make bonds and put them upon his neck is once more the type of the bound Jesus. As he was in weeping over Jerusalem, in foretelling

<sup>1</sup> *Oracles*, pp. 82 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Mutual whitewashing of Herod and Pilate—needed by Herod for having killed the popular John the Baptist, by Pilate for massacring the Galileans who were "of Herod's jurisdiction" (Luke xii.).

<sup>3</sup> An objection may be raised that Jer. xxvii. deals with a later reign than Jer. xxvi., that of Zedekiah. Yet LXX, which we follow throughout, makes no distinction, while the Hebrew, followed by Aquila (120 A.D.?) dates it, along with Jer. xxvi., of Jehoiakim.

its destruction, in his frequent use of parable, so he was in being bound as a prisoner of his own will: he was a type of voluntary obedience, though in Jeremiah xxvii. 1 the bondage is itself figurative. This fact involves no undue strain upon our imagination. The strain commences when we try to understand how the prophet was to despatch the bonds and pillories to the kings, or the king, and how they would be received.

But in LXX the action is simplified. For *the king of Idumea* has (in the reading of A, Q) the article prefixed, the other *kings* have not, though the preposition is prefixed to each. The article requires us to translate as above, *to him who is king of Idumea, Moab, Ammon, Tyre and Sidon*. Now in 30 A.D. and till 39 the tetrarchy of Antipas included the *sons of Ammon*. Moab, though not included in it, was commanded by his strong fortress of Machærus on its northern frontier. But Idumea was identified, for literary purposes at least, with the Idumean sovereign Herod Antipas. And though Tyre and Sidon were outside Galilee the other portion of Antipas's tetrarchy, they were dependent upon it for their prosperity, as Luke showed (Acts xii. 20). Therefore there were no kings of all these places in the time of Antipas but himself. It follows that a Greek reader of Jeremiah xxvii. 1 was compelled to construe it as above, and a Christian prophet to identify *the king* with Antipas, to whom alone the bonds and yokes were to be despatched.

It is possible that *bonds* (*δεσμούς*) was understood by Mark to be *bondsmen* (*δεσμίους*), because the two words were frequently<sup>1</sup> interchanged by the error of copyists or readers in the first Christian centuries. This brings us still nearer to the representative Bondsman.

In whatever way they were sent by Jeremiah "by the

<sup>1</sup> Proofs are found in the variant readings of Zech. ix. 11, 12, Heb. x. 34, Acts xvi. 25.



hands of the envoys who came to meet him (the text is here confused) at Jerusalem," his Antitype could only send them to Herod by wearing them on His own body. In the ordinary Roman way He was bound when sent by Pilate, though by a horrible jest on Herod's part He was sent (*ἀνέπεμψεν* in both cases) by him to Pilate arrayed in fine apparel. The atrocious practical joke was that the Idumean king, having received from Pilate, whom he hated, a poor bundle of bonds, returned the prisoner disguised as a king in some disused court garment. The jest was the occasion of the two enemies becoming friends.

There is a slight approximation in Luke xxiii. 7, *being himself in Jerusalem in these days*, to Jeremiah xxvii. 1, *that come to meet him at Jerusalem*. In fact the only words of the sentence that refuse any visible fulfilment are *Zedekiah* and *Judah*.

That the incident is omitted by Mark and Matthew and pointedly by John—or rather they attribute the clothing in purple to Pilate's soldiers—does not forbid its being connected with Jeremiah xxvi., which all four evangelists employed. The three saw that it was not in Jeremiah xxvi., even if they saw it in Jeremiah xxvii. : on the other hand, they had not the special source of information which Luke had in connexion with the Herodian family. Supposing that Philip at Cæsarea had some rudimentary account or even rumour of it, this may have been used to *follow along* (as he and Luke would think) with the oracle.

Perhaps, too, the narrative is due to another consideration. Before Luke's Gospel St. Paul had been sent by a later Roman procurator to a later Herod (Acts xxv. 21 *ἀναπέμψω*). The disciple could not be greater than his Lord. (Compare also Acts xviii. 15 of Gallio's attitude with John xviii. 31 of Pilate's.)

Apart, however, from such a speculation let us see

whether the Herodian story was not based upon another oracle. The climax of it is that *Herod and Pilate were made friends that day*. Now in Acts iv. the thanksgiving of the disciples quotes Psalm ii., "Why do *the heathen* rage and *the peoples* imagine vain things? The kings of the earth stood by, and *the princes were brought together* (συνήχθησαν) against the Lord and against his Christ." And it proceeds to explain, "For there were *brought together* in truth in this city against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou anointedst, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with *the heathen* and *the peoples* of Israel, to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel foreordained to take place." (*Hand* here must be *spirit*, as so often, for the hand performs but cannot fore-ordain.)

What is the meaning of the explanation? First, we note that in Psalm ii. by itself *the peoples* meant the enemies of Israel, *the heathen* being its parallel. But in Acts iv. this plural is made by a most daring application to mean the tribes of Israel itself, which was always hitherto the singular because privileged *people*. The oracle therefore has been strained in order to express two combinations, that of Herod and Pilate, and that of Gentiles and Jews, against Christ. But our present point is that *Herod and Pilate were brought together*. Now the meaning of *brought together* as *reconciling* is irreproachable in Greek. It was therefore fair, so far, for Luke to apply the Psalm thus—if only Herod and Pilate were *the kings* reconciled. The oracle, then, is clearly one source of his information, while their previous enmity was a matter of current knowledge.

But how was the reconciliation effected? For we began by observing that Luke represented the reaction of Pilate *the prince* in favour of the Accused by ranking Herod along with him. Is he consistent with himself in carrying out this purpose?



The late Dr. Verrall in his stimulating essay<sup>1</sup> undertook to show that the Herod interview was credible and harmonious provided we do not admit the mockery by Herod of the Accused. Unfortunately, the condition remains unfulfilled. To take *ἐμπαλξας* only of jesting is not adequate: nor does he make good this point. *Mockery* alone is adequate, as the concordances to both Testaments abundantly show. But the particular oracle on which this *mockery* is based is—

Psalm xxxviii. 7, "My soul is full of *mockeries*."

If this observation appears to be unwarranted, let the context of this Psalm be observed. The reader's attention has been drawn to it by St. John quoting it in his description of that agony of the Lord which he has substituted for Gethsemane.

Psalm xxxviii. 10, "*My soul is troubled*" (John xii. 27).

In fact the rest of the Psalm is as closely fulfilled in the incidents of the Trials as Psalm xxii. is in those of the Crucifixion.

*Ib.* 11, "They that were nearest to me *stood afar off*." (So did Peter follow Jesus *afar off*. So did all His acquaintance *stand afar off*.)

*Ib.* 12, "They that *sought* my life forced me away, and they that *sought* mischief for me spake vanities. . . ." (So the sanhedrin *sought* witness to put Him to death, and found it not.)

*Ib.* 13, "Like one that is dumb, who openeth not his mouth." (So was Jesus silent before the high priest.)

*Ib.* 14, "And hath not reproofs in his mouth." (So was He silent before Pilate (Mark), before Herod (Luke).

*Ib.* 16, "When my feet were shaken they blustered against me." ("Behold how many things they accuse thee of.")

*Ib.* 17, "I was ready to be scourged." (So Mark xv. 15,

Luke xxiii. 22, "I will chastise him and release him.")

*Ib.* 18, "I declare my iniquity, and will bethink me of my sin." (So, "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil . . . I have spoken openly" (John).

*Ib.* 19, "They that hate me wrongfully are multiplied." (So, "If the world hateth me . . .")

*Ib.* 20, "They that returned me evil for good slanderously accused me." Luke applies this in saying "there *stood* (*ib.* 11 'drew near and *stood* against me,' also Ps. xxxv. 11, 'unjust witnesses *stood up* and questioned me') the high priests and the scribes hotly accusing him." And this is what leads up to the *mockery* of Herod.

But while Luke uses so freely the phraseology of Psalm xxxviii. he easily passes to that of—

Psalm xxii. 6. A shame of man and *made a cipher* of the people (*ἐξουθένημα*).<sup>1</sup>

As Verrall showed—though he had not Psalm xxii. in view—the R.V. *set him at naught* (*ἐξουθενήσας*) is incorrect. The verb of the evangelist is drawn from the psalmist's noun. Thus Luke has assigned to the Herodian narrative the robing, some "hot" accusations, the silence (here is a great contrast to Mark and Matthew), and this *mockery*, though he has previously described the Jewish *mockery* (*ἐνέριαιζον* xxii. 63), where it means anything but the friendly jesting which Verrall wishes to make it mean in Herod. Instead, therefore, of supposing with Loisy a "document which Luke knew and used," we only presuppose the oracles mentioned above. A "Herod-document" may simply be represented by the notes and the memory of Philip of Caesarea as a student of the oracles. Since *ἐξουθενήσας* implies utter scorn and hatred, so *ἐμπαιξας* in the same line means the same.

<sup>1</sup> Since "Barnabas" (date 70 A.D.) uses *ἐξουθενήσας* (ch. vii.) of the Crucifixion, the above statement is fully borne out.



I cannot therefore follow my revered former instructor in mitigating the action of Herod to infinity. If Herod was "discharging him as innocent," having "questioned him at much length," not unkindly, not judicially, but as "delighted in the celebrated wonder-worker," while "his hopes of a performance preoccupied him, it appears, completely," why did not Jesus answer Herod anything? To refuse a word in answer to the long speeches (λόγοις ἱκανοῖς) of this powerful prince and despot was certainly to irritate him. He, however, mildly presents the poor prisoner with such clothing which "the prince himself puts on"—a mark of honour that Verrall thinks was not ironical.<sup>1</sup>

Nor can I agree that "the refusal of the magician to respond to his advances, though it could not please, must stimulate his curiosity, and might naturally increase his respect." How could Herod sit there while the Jewish authorities stood and watched him rebuffed?

Another fact to which Verrall hardly allowed enough importance is that Luke alone has reported the alleged previous enmity of Herod (xiii. 31, "some Pharisees tell him . . . Herod wisheth to slay thee"). He says, "It is mentioned for the sake of the answer"; "whether it is true, whether authorised, whether believed—all is uncertain." The fact, however, of its presence can only imply that Herod was a supposed deadly foe and prepare us for his unchanged enmity. Luke's omission of "the Herodians" in Mark viii. 15, xii. 13 proves nothing. From Mark xii. 13 he has omitted "the Pharisees."

Nor is the subsequent history of the *bright raiment*, which Verrall pursues, recorded in particular by Luke. At the Crucifixion he quotes Psalm xxii. 18 without changing a

<sup>1</sup> But Verrall presses the active voice of περιβαλῶν unduly, failing to see that it is used of *clothing oneself* in Ezek. xvi. 18, while Ezek. xviii. 7, 16 also support the middle sense. He overlooked LXX.

word and without an observation. It is only St. John who enlarges upon the lottery, and St. John ignored the Herod-interview. He, too, quotes and works upon Psalm xxii., but instead of referring to the *bright raiment* of Luke, he introduces quite a new idea when he makes the seamless robe to be that of Jesus the High Priest (Exod. xxviii. 4, 27, *χιτῶνα, ποδήρη ὅλον*). Thus no further light is thrown upon the Herodian action.

The position, then, is this: Pilate, who as one of *the princes* (Jer. xxvi.) had led the reaction in favour of Jesus, eventually by his weakness and gross injustice, on which Luke particularly dwells, *delivers him to their will*. Herod joined Pilate in the reaction so far as to be *brought together with Him*, yet he had *scorned Him and mocked Him*—and what besides? He “gets up a charade,” says Verrall with some irony. But that is just what he did: he left it to Pilate to guess what he thought. Verrall’s own interpretation is open to the objection of being prosaic—as if Herod said, “Hand me yonder woollen garment: I will clothe the worthy man myself.” The costume was his letter of reply to Pilate and he might take it either way—‘I think better of Him than you do,’ or more probably ‘I appreciate the joke of one more prince of the Jews.’ He makes no positive attempt to save Jesus. But since Luke aims at the two objects, of uniting Him to Pilate in the favourable reaction (Jer., Luke), and also in the final responsibility for the death (Ps. ii., Acts iv.), what was he to do with the robing but leave it as an enigma?

The reader must not be left, however, without an absolute proof that Luke in the Trial-narrative was deeply imbued with Jeremiah xxvi. The proof is in the sentence (Luke xxii. 54), *Συλλαβόντες δὲ αὐτὸν ἤγαγον καὶ εἰσήγαγον εἰς . . .* “*And they seized him and led him and led him into the high priest’s house*. The E.V. has

changed the second *and led him into and brought him* in order to screen the clumsiness, but this is bad translation. Of course we ask, How can Luke, a good scholar, have been so clumsy? Some editors will not believe it. Blass is one who omits the second *and led him* with D etc. But the external evidence is overwhelming that Luke wrote it, and the internal evidence overwhelming that he did not write this jingling repetition.<sup>1</sup> The collision of evidence is severe.

One glance at the oracle, and the confidence of our internal evidence vanishes. There, in Jeremiah xxvi. 23 (text of A, which nearly always represents the text which our Lord and the apostles used: see *Oracles in N.T.*, p. 76, etc.) is the phrase almost word for word: *καὶ συνελάβοσαν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξήγαγον αὐτὸν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ εἰσήγαγον αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα* (it will be shown elsewhere that *king* was a term applicable to the high priest). In fact, what Luke would never have written by himself he was willing to write from the oracle. Even *the men (who held him, xxii. 63)* is *the men* of Jeremiah xxvi. 22: *men* is superfluous. The *πρὸς, before*, is actually preserved in Mark, Matthew, John. And this indicates that all four evangelists interpreted *the king* in the sense then current, of the high priest. But instead of *before* (Mark), Luke wrote *to the dwelling of*; because apparently he reasoned back to Jeremiah xxxi. 10, *the king's house*, i.e. the high priest's house. This verse, Luke xxii. 54, is the origin of the whole opinion that Jesus was tried or heard in a dwelling-house. It will be shown elsewhere, on the contrary, that the trial was in the temple.

This is the eighteenth parallel between Jeremiah xxvi. and the Trial-narratives. There are several more parallels to follow—some still more remarkable.

E. C. SELWYN.

<sup>1</sup> Eur. Bac. 1065 is irrelevant here.